



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/645,099

08/21/2003

Jeff Scott Eder

VM-55

7276

53787

7590

12/03/2010

ASSET TRUST, INC.  
2020 MALTBY ROAD  
SUITE 7362  
BOTHELL, WA 98021

EXAMINER

MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3684

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/03/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10645099	8/21/2003	EDER, JEFF SCOTT	VM-55

ASSET TRUST, INC.  
2020 MALTBY ROAD  
SUITE 7362  
BOTHELL, WA 98021

**EXAMINER**

Susanna M.. Diaz

ART UNIT	PAPER
3684	20101124

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The reply filed on June 30, 2010 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because: In a notice of non-compliant amendment mailed to Applicant on April 2, 2010, Applicant was specifically asked to provide the proper status identifier for each claim. Applicant was particularly asked to correct the status identifiers of claims 33-40 to reflect these claims as "withdrawn." In response to the notice of non-compliant amendment, Applicant still fails to identify claims 33-40 as withdrawn. Applicant completely fails to address the status identifier issues raised in the notice of non-compliant amendment; therefore, the reply filed on June 30, 2010 is deemed to be non-responsive. Since no attempt was made to address the status identifier issues raised in the notice of non-compliant amendment mailed on April 2, 2010, Applicant's reply filed on June 30, 2010 is deemed to be a non-bona-fide attempt at a proper response to the last Office correspondence of April 2, 2010. Additionally, Applicant filed a petition to suspend prosecution on June 30, 2010. This petition was denied. Applicant has been granted no additional period for response.

/Susanna M. Diaz/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3684